

REMARKS

Claims 1-31 were pending in the subject application as of the March 21, 2006 mailing date of the current office action; however, claims 15-31 were withdrawn in view of Applicant's previous election of claims 1-14.

Summary of Rejections in the Current Office Action

Claims 1-14 stand separately rejected pursuant to the first and second paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 112. Also, claims 1-3 and 12-14 are rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0073083 to Ikeda et al. ("the Ikeda publication"), and claims 4-7 are rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the combination of the Ikeda publication and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0054258 to Maeda et al. ("the Maeda publication"). Applicant notes, for the record, that in paragraphs 12-16 and 18-22 of the current office action the Examiner discusses a "Suzuki" reference when it appears he intended to refer to the Ikeda publication.

Summary of Objections in the Current Office Action

The Examiner objects to the current title of the invention as being non-descriptive and requires a new title "clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed."

Allowable Subject Matter in the Current Office Action

The Examiner identifies claims 8-12 of as being allowable but for their rejections pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112.

Summary of Amendments and Cancellations

In response to the Examiner's objection, Applicant has deleted the title of the invention as filed and has replaced it with a new title. Applicant maintains that the title of the invention, as filed, was clear and descriptive; however, Applicant introduces a new title herein solely to expedite prosecution of the subject application.

Moreover, Applicant amends claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of claim 9, which, therefore, is canceled without prejudice. Claims 10 and 11, each of which depends from claim 9, are amended to depend from claim 1. Lastly, Applicant cancels previously withdrawn claims 15-31 without prejudice. Applicant notes, for the record, that it amends and cancels these claims solely to expedite prosecution of the subject application. By doing so, Applicant does not dedicate their subject matter to the public, and does not acquiesce to the rejections of claims 1-14, to the restriction of claims 15-31, or to the Examiner's reasons offered in support thereof. Applicant also reserves the right to seek patent protection for claims similar or identical to the amended and/or canceled claims in one or more related applications.

Response to Examiner's Rejections

The Examiner indicated that claim 9 was allowable over the references that form the basis of the prior art rejections of claim 1. Thus, because Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 9, the prior art rejections of claim 1 are moot and should be withdrawn. Moreover, because claim 1 is allowable over the prior art, so too are claims 2-14, each of which depends either directly or ultimately from claim 1.

Regarding the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejections, Applicant submits that such rejections, if even proper, have been overcome in view of the amendment to claim 1.

As amended and in pertinent part, claim 1 calls for determining first and second servo control signal values and increasing the range of motion of the viewing head of the remote viewing device by recalibrating the operation of the remote viewing device based on at least the first servo control value and the second servo control signal value. In short, claim 1 complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, and thus the rejections thereunder should be withdrawn as should be those of claims 2-14, each of which also meets the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112.

Conclusion

In view of at least the amendments and remarks set forth herein, currently pending claims 1-14 are believed to be patentable over the prior art of record and to meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Therefore, claims 1-14 are in condition for immediate allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of these claims and of this application.

If the undersigned can be of any assistance in advancing the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact him using the contact information provided below.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant respectfully refers the Examiner to an Information Disclosure Statement that was filed by Applicant on June 6, 2006 in connection with the subject application.

Authorization To Charge Necessary Fees

Although no fee is believed to be due with this submission, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any necessary fees associated therewith, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-0289.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard J. Roos
Reg. No. 45,053

Dated: June 21, 2006

WALL MARJAMA & BILINSKI LLP
101 South Salina Street, Suite 400
Syracuse, New York 13202
Telephone: (315) 425-9000
Facsimile: (315) 425-9114

Customer No.: **20874**
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE